

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 105

SO 034 438

AUTHOR Stradling, Robert
TITLE Meeting of the Working Group on "History and History Teaching in South East Europe" (Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, December 16-17, 2001).
INSTITUTION Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE 2001-12-00
NOTE 26p.; The meeting was supported by the European Cultural Foundation, KulturKontakt Austria, and the Council of Europe.
AVAILABLE FROM Council of Europe, F67075 Strasbourg, Cedex, France. Tel: 33-3-88-41-20-00; Web site: <http://www.coe.int>. For full text: http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/History_Teaching/.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *History; *History Instruction; Instructional Development; Program Proposals; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Europe (Southeast); Professional Meetings

ABSTRACT

The December 2001 meeting of the Working Group on History and History Teaching in South East Europe had four main objectives: (1) to review developments in the Task Force's program of activities for history and history education since December 1999; (2) to report on the progress and outcomes of the Quick Start projects; (3) to discuss the problems and difficulties experienced by the project teams; and (4) to discuss priorities and activities for Phase 2. This meeting report consists of the following sections: (1) "Introduction and Agenda for the Meeting" (Agenda Items 1-3); (2) "Developments in the Programme of Activities since December 1999 and in the Stability Pact" (Agenda Items 4 and 6); (3) "Presentation of the Quick Start Projects" (Item 5); and (4) "Call for New Project Proposals" (Item 8). Appendix I--"Criteria Framework for Project Proposal Assessment"; Appendix II "List of Participants." (BT)

**Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, 16-17
December 2001**

Meeting of the Working Group on "History and History Teaching in South East Europe"

**Draft report by Dr. Robert STRADLING,
United Kingdom**

SO 034 438

Council of Europe

F67075 Strasbourg Cedex, France

2001

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE,
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Boech-Jacobsen

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

The meeting was supported by the European Cultural Foundation, KulturKontakt AUSTRIA and the Council of Europe

STABILITY PACT

HISTORY AND HISTORY TEACHING IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE

- I. INTRODUCTION AND AGENDA FOR THE MEETING (Agenda Items 1-3)
- II. DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES SINCE DECEMBER 1999 AND IN THE STABILITY PACT (Agenda Items 4 and 6)
- III. PRESENTATION OF THE QUICK START PROJECTS (Item 5)
- IV. CALL FOR NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS (Item 8)

APPENDIX I - CRITERIA FRAMEWORK FOR PROJECT PROPOSAL ASSESMENT

APPENDIX II - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

I. INTRODUCTION AND AGENDA FOR THE MEETING (Agenda Items 1-3) .

The participants were welcomed by the Chair, Alison CARDWELL, Co-ordinator of the Working Group on History and History Teaching in SEE. A special welcome was extended to the new members and observers. The Chair began by explaining that the meeting had four main objectives which were to:

- review developments in the Task Force's programme of activities for history and history education since December 1999;
- report on the progress and outcomes of the Quick Start projects;
- discuss the problems and difficulties experienced by the project teams;
- discuss priorities and activities for Phase 2.

II. DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES SINCE DECEMBER 1999 AND IN THE STABILITY PACT (Agenda Items 4 and 6) .

Heidrun SCHULZE, on behalf of the Task Force Education and Youth, reported on the key developments that had taken place during Phase 1. Within the Task Force, the first 18 months had concentrated on implementing the Quick Start history projects. Around half of these would be completed by January 2002. The rest would continue into the coming year and some already had funding for next phase activities.

It was generally felt within the Stability Pact that considerable progress had been made during the first two years, particularly with regard to the Quick Start Projects. However, two major issues had emerged. The first issue related to the degree of coherence and congruence between the strategies being adopted by the European Commission and the Stability Pact vis-à-vis the SEE region. Discussions have helped to clarify the situation. The Commission's primary concern will be with matters relating to the Stabilisation and Association Process (SAP), which should lead to the full integration of SEE countries into European structures; the Stability Pact is seen primarily as an instrument for regional co-operation being complementary to the SAP and the accession process.

The second broad issue related to the focus and priorities of the Stability Pact. The sectoral donors have stressed the need for more effective coordination within and across the Working Tables and a re-focusing of the main aims and priorities to be achieved through Stability Pact activities. It was felt that it was now necessary to move on from short-term measures to a strategy based on medium to long-term sustainable development. When Working Table I (which is concerned with Democratisation and Human Rights) met for the fourth time in Portoroz, Slovenia, in May 2001 the main aim was to reach a consensus on the future orientation and focus of the Working Table. Initially, in 1999, WTI had decided to focus on seven priority areas: human rights and national minorities, good governance, gender, media, parliamentary cooperation, education and youth, and the return and integration of refugees. In Portoroz, the WTI decided to concentrate its efforts on four priority areas: inter-ethnic relations and cross-border co-operation; media; education and youth; and refugees. However, this re-focusing of activities and re-setting of priorities did not imply the cessation of the existing Task Forces. In line with the Stability Pact process of a re-focusing of strategies and priorities, the Task Force Education and Youth together with the Working Groups developed a "Strategic Framework and Priorities for Action", which was presented to donors in order to identify their possible interest in the priorities. Their reaction to the Task Force's approach was encouraging. Some donors already indicated financial support for specific activities, others will make their decisions on the basis of concrete project proposals.

The Task Force Education and Youth, like the other Task Forces, had spent much of 2001 lobbying on behalf of its primary area of concern. Whilst it was encouraging that Education and Youth remained as one of the priority areas of WTI, it was also likely that less money would be available for its activities than during the Quick Start phase. This presented the Task Force and its constituent Working Groups with a dilemma. We want new projects but we do not want to raise expectations too highly within the region. So it was important that the History Working Group reviewed its priorities, re-focused them if necessary, and the calls for new proposals would then need to indicate the criteria by which these proposals would be assessed.

To facilitate this process, Ms Schulze distributed a short paper outlining the general criteria for project proposal assessment

that would be applied to all projects submitted to the Task Force Education and Youth. The General Criteria were originally included in the Task Force's Strategic Framework and Priorities for Action, July 2001. But for those members of the History Working Group who were not able to attend the meeting in Sarajevo and do not have copies of the Strategic Framework it has been appended to this Report. Ms Schulze suggested that we might want to use some of our time at this meeting to review our priorities and then to determine whether or not we wished to define a more detailed Criteria Framework specifically for assessing **history** proposals.

She finished her presentation by explaining that the deadline for new project proposals will be sometime in the second half of February to dovetail with donors' budget lines.

Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD wanted to know why it was necessary to set a deadline for donors. She felt that negotiations with donors would probably be ongoing, need to be tailored to their individual requirements and likely to be undertaken to a large degree by project coordinators. Ms Schulze agreed and thought that there might be several deadlines over the course of the year but that it was necessary to have an initial deadline to facilitate the screening of projects.

Several members of the group then wanted to know how much longer the Stability Pact was likely to run since this clearly had implications for project planning. Ms Schulze responded that at present the Task Force did not have much information on this and that some of the information was contradictory. The following discussion focused on whether or not the Task Force (and the donors) were looking for a second round of projects with timescales similar to those of the Quick Start projects. The general view of the Working Group was that project durations of 12-18 months were too short to achieve anything substantial, particularly when they were aiming to change practice at school level or in initial and in-service training. Ms Schulze agreed that this was probably the case and the Task Force would welcome a commitment from donors to longer projects. This would fit in with the current thinking within the Stability Pact about the need to encourage medium-term sustainable development. A possible way of coping with the different time lines could be to split medium- or long-term projects into several modules which would

built on each other, but which could also work separately and have concrete results each.

Discussion then moved to the continuing function of the History Working Group. Halil BERKTAY pointed out that the Working Group had been set up before the Stability Pact was implemented and that the Stability Pact framework had been grafted on top of the Graz Process and its various Working Groups. If the Stability Pact ceased to function in the next year or two the History Working Group would still have a valuable role to play as a forum for discussing new ideas and approaches and as a means of facilitating bilateral and multilateral initiatives and cooperation.

Other issues relating in particular to the Working Group's priorities for phase 2 and to the criteria for assessing new project proposals were held over until the call for new projects was discussed later in the meeting.

III. PRESENTATION OF THE QUICK START PROJECTS (Item 5)

Southeast European Joint History Project (Phase 2)

Implementing Agency	Center for Democracy & Reconciliation in SEE
Donors	Austria, Switzerland
Pledge in Euros	75,000 Euro [46,000 Euro still required as of 1.12.2000]

Professor Christina KOULOURI was unable to attend the meeting due to travel problems beyond her control and so Professor Halil BERKTAY reported on this project in her place. A second round of seven teacher training workshops had now been completed successfully. These covered the First World War and the Creation of Yugoslavia, the Second World War, the creation of the Albanian State, the Ottoman Empire and the creation of Nation States, Cyprus, and the Balkan Wars. These workshops were aimed at both primary and secondary school teachers.

A third round of workshops is now being planned to be held in 2002. Possible topics being discussed include further workshops on the Balkan Wars and World War II, the Ottoman Empire and Society and the formation of Nation States in the Balkans during the 19th Century. Professor Berkday announced that Sabanci University, Turkey? were planning to run the workshop on the Ottoman Empire and Society.

Shared History Project: Deconstruction of National Hate Narratives

Implementing Agency	Sabanci University (Turkey), Panteion University (Greece) and Columbia University (USA)
Donors	USA
Pledge in Euros	84,000 Euro

Professor Berkday then went on to provide an up-date on the Shared History Project. The US funding for the project had been delayed by the Presidential elections and the project had been maintained by Sabanci University during the interim period. The money had finally arrived two weeks before this meeting of the History Working Group.

The intention is to bring Turkish and Greek historians and social scientists together to critically examine and deconstruct eight controversial issues which are sensitive in both countries. Work has been ongoing on the processes of constructing Grand Narratives and communal memories around the burning of Smyrna/Izmir in 1922. The outcome will be a scholarly volume including parallel and joint contributions by Turkish and Greek academics. The next issue to be examined in the same way will be the Greek Revolution and the subsequent London Conference and how it was perceived by various groups and parties in both countries.

The collaborating Universities hope that the Shared History Project will serve as a model for cross-border cooperation by academics.

Understanding a Shared Past, Learning for the Future (Phase 1 project)

Implementing Agency	EUROCLIO
Donors	The Netherlands
Pledge in Euros	724,000 Euros [2000-2003]

Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD reported that this project pre-dated the Stability Pact's Quick Start Initiative. The aim was to work with the History Teachers' Associations in Albania, Bulgaria and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" to develop joint teachers' resource packs and a Teacher Handbook on the history of everyday life. Workshops and planning meetings have been taking place in "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Albania and Bulgaria on a regular basis since February 2001. Materials for the packs are now available in raw format covering political, social and economic life in each country. The next main task is to merge this material into a comparative format.

There is also a strong commitment to the integration of linguistic, ethnic and religious minorities within the materials and work is now underway on the history of the Roma in the Balkans. Preparation of the printing of the Handbook has started and local groups are looking for suitable translators and editors.

The project is now looking for additional funding to run more in-service training seminars based on the resource packs and handbook.

Ms van der Leeuw-Roord also reported on two other projects ,which are linked to the Quick Start Projects:

The Development of History Curricula in Albania (Phase 2 project)

Implementing Agencies	EUROCLIO, Albanian Ministry of Education & Science, Albanian History Teachers Association
Anticipated Donor	The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Estimated cost	169,350 Euros [2002-2004]

Ms van der Leeuw-Roord reported that a proposal had been submitted to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and they were now awaiting a response. This would be a three-year project in which EUROCLIO would work with history education specialists from the Albanian Ministry of Education, inspectors and teachers to design, pilot and implement new curricula for secondary and high school students (aged 12-18). There will also be scope for exploiting potential synergy between this initiative and the trilateral project with "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and Bulgaria referred to above.

Disarming History Project (Phase 2 project)

Implementing Agencies	Association for Social History (ASH) and EUROCLIO
Donors	Dutch Embassy, Belgrade and Danish Foreign Ministry
Pledge in Euros	42,400 DM [2001-2002]

Ms van der Leeuw-Roord reported that, in December 2001, the Association for Social History, Belgrade, with the support of EUROCLIO, set up a branch of EUROCLIO in Serbia and also established an independent History Teachers' Association in Serbia (ASH-EUROCLIO). This initiative is part of a wider project, *Disarming History*, which has a number of related objectives including:

- Initiating and promoting changes in history education;
- Supporting the professional development of history teachers in Serbia;
- Establishing links with other history teachers' associations in the Balkans;
- Establishing a Centre for the Learning and Teaching of History;
- Offering constructive advice to the Serbian Ministry of Education in the field of curricula, textbooks and teacher training for history.

Creating Additional Materials for Teaching SEE History

Implementing Agency	CSBSC - Centre for the Study of the Balkan Society, University of Graz, Austria
Donors	Austria, OSCE, CSBSC
Pledge in Euros	161,370 Euros

The objective here was to develop teaching materials for secondary school teachers, and resource materials for university lecturers and their students on common cultural and historical characteristics of the countries of the SEE region. Topics and themes are not related directly to national history; they lend themselves to a transnational approach. They include the history of childhood, gender, migration, old age and work. The work is being led by three teams, one based at the Center for the Study of the Balkan Society, University of Graz, one at the Association for Social History, Belgrade and one based at the Balkanski Seminar at the University of Blagoevgrad. The work involves producing academic volumes on each topic which are aimed at HE students and tutors and then converting the research material in these volumes into a format suitable for teaching materials aimed at secondary school students.

Professor Karl KASER reported that the first volume on Childhood, was published in English in April 2001 and is now being translated into nine SEE languages. It includes contributions from every country in the region. The translated editions should be published by the end of December 2001. Teacher training seminars have been run around the topic of childhood and the response has been very positive

The production of the manuscript for the second volume, on Gender, was delayed mainly because of problems in finding contributors, getting them to understand what was required, and finding suitable materials in each country. They had experienced some translation problems as well.

Generally, the project teams have found that the deadlines they set for themselves were not as realistic as they had assumed. They plan to continue the project by introducing new topics but they will allow more time for the research to be undertaken and will only attempt to produce one academic volume and one

resource pack per year with provision for follow-up in-service teacher training in subsequent years.

They also believe that it is necessary to do more to change the practice of history teaching at the University level where the next generation of history teachers are being trained.

Textbook Development and Comparison in History in SEE

Implementing Agency	Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research
Donors	Germany
Pledge in Euros	243,000 Euros

This project has three main aims:

- To develop a trans-national communication network for textbook authors, scholars and education stakeholders in SEE;
- To explore possibilities for presenting history using different kinds of media;
- To facilitate cross-border textbook research.

Heike KARGE reported that, in the first part of 2001, much of the project activity had focused on setting up the Virtual Textbook Centre in partnership with the University of Zagreb at the website www.see-textbook.net. The addition of new information and material on curricula, textbook analysis, etc. will be undertaken by co-ordinators for each participating country. They have been appointed for Croatia, BiH, and Serbia but the Institute is still seeking co-ordinators for the other countries involved.

The Georg Eckert Institute jointly (with UNESCO) organised a seminar in Sarajevo in April 2001 on "*Curriculum and Textbook development for history teaching in Bosnia and Herzegovina*". The target group included ministry officials, teacher educators, textbook authors, history teachers, historians and international experts. The project team is now having meetings with OHR, the Council of Europe and UNESCO and follow-up seminars in Sarajevo are being planned for 2002.

In July 2001, the Institute published a journal on "Minorities in Textbooks in South Eastern Europe" which included articles on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Croatia and other SEE countries.

A summer school was held in Braunschweig on 24-30 September 2001 on the topic "*The Balkans in Europe*". The main aims were to appraise the balance between national, regional and European history in textbooks; examine crucial topics for interpreting the interrelations of the Balkans and the rest of Europe, and look at how to present controversial issues of Balkan and European history in textbooks. As a follow-up some teaching units are now being developed on National Holidays in the region and the break-up of the former Yugoslavia, which will eventually be available on the textbook website.

Dr Sabine RUTAR joined the project team in September and will be working specifically on coordinating the process of accumulating information about curricula, textbooks and other materials in the Former Republics of Yugoslavia and developing a network for textbook authors, scholars and others. Since she had only been in post for a few weeks it was too early to report on progress but a scholar from Belgrade was currently working in Braunschweig on a textbook on medieval history and Dr Rutar was beginning to establish a small network. However, there were one or two problems in encouraging transnational cooperation which still needed to be resolved.

Comparative Study: Structures and Standards in the Initial Training of History Teachers in SE Europe

Implementing Agencies	Council of Europe and Institute for Economic & Social History, University of Vienna
Donors	Austria
Pledge in Euros	40,000 Euros

Professor Alois ECKER reported that the questionnaire for surveying current provision and practice was distributed to 2-4 experts in each SEE country during 2001. The preliminary results were discussed at a meeting of experts in Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria, on 18-19 May 2001. Some of the information already

provided was clarified and some additional information was provided. A second meeting was held in Podgorica, Montenegro, in September 2001, where an overview of the final results was discussed and plans for the next stage of the project were finalised. Data on initial teacher training in some countries is still patchy but steps have been taken to obtain the missing data. It was anticipated that the report will be available early in 2002.

Professor Ecker gave a brief overview of the main trends in the research, emphasising that, on average, less than 15 per cent of Initial Teacher Training Courses is concerned with didactics and practical training. This raises an important question about the pedagogical skills which the students have when they graduate and move into teaching.

Once the report has been finalised, it is intended to disseminate the findings to Ministries of Education and TEI institutions in each country and then develop training seminars on a regional basis for teacher trainers.

National and Regional History Teacher Training Seminars

Implementing Agency	Council of Europe in partnership with EUROCLIO
Donors	Austria, Switzerland with some local funding for specific seminars and workshops in partner countries, Greece
Pledge in Euros	107,500 Euros

Ms Cardwell reported that, following the original stocktaking conference in Athens (28-30 September 2000), a total of seven national and regional teacher training seminars were held in 2001. The first was held in Tirana, Albania (23-24 February 2001), followed by seminars in Belgrade, FRY (5-7 March), Ohrid, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" (7-8 May), Bled, Slovenia (18-20 October, Budapest, Hungary (8-10 November), Ias, Romania (12-14 November) and Sarajevo, BiH (14-15 December).

The emphasis in the planning of these workshops and seminars has been on new pedagogies usually within the context of teaching modern, particularly 20th Century history. The main themes have been active learning, enquiry-based methods,

multiperspectivity and teaching about controversial and sensitive issues.

The main donors were Austria and Switzerland. However, the Greek Authorities covered the travel and subsistence expenses of all the participants in the Conference in Athens in September 2000 and the Ministries of Education of Slovenia, Hungary and Romania covered the subsistence expenses. For the Sarajevo Seminar, the OHR covered the costs of the local participants.

Ms. Yana Genova from Open Society Institute could not attend the meeting and could therefore not report on the "Multiauthor Textbook of 20th Century SEE History" and on the "Key Studies of Recent Regional History".

For further information on these projects, see the Quick Start Progress Report as of December 2001 on the homepage of the Enhanced Graz Process.

IV. CALL FOR NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS (Item 8) .

Before discussing ideas for new projects Ms Cardwell proposed that the Working Group should discuss some of the issues raised by Ms Schulze in her presentation on recent developments in the Stability Pact and Task Force Education & Youth which might have implications for the next round of history projects.

Ms Schulze had suggested that the Working Group might wish to review its priority areas and determine whether it wished to make any changes. Ms Cardwell reminded the Group that its current priorities were detailed on p.20 of the Task Force's Strategic Framework and Priorities for Action (July 2001) which had been distributed to all members of the Group. These are reproduced below:

Curriculum development for history teaching

- Stocktaking on history curricula in the region;
- Review process and dissemination of information on experiences in the development and implementation of new curricula.

Initial and in-service training of history teachers

- Focus on potential multipliers both in pre- and in-service teacher training;
- Focus on active and enquiry based learning methods;
- Regional training on how to teach topics, themes/periods which teachers often found difficult, i.e.

Periods: early origins of the peoples of the region, Middle Ages, the Ottoman Period, 20th century history of the region, the Communist era.

Topics/themes: Balkan Wars, Civil Wars, World War II, Cold War, ideological movements, 20th Century dictatorships, recent conflicts, period of transition since 1989, the history of everyday life.

The development of teaching resources for history

- Development of teaching resources on the topics/periods listed under teacher training;
- Combination of the development of teaching resources and teacher training in the use of new materials;
- Development of teaching resources at regional level;
- Extension of ongoing projects to other countries of the region.

History teaching in higher education

- Creating linkages between higher education and the school level;
- Establishment of regional networks/exchange programmes of teachers, students, pupils.

The first question to be considered was: should we retain the four priority areas or reduce them to two or three? There was consensus within the Working Group that we should retain the four priorities - they were all essential for supporting change and innovation in history education within the region - but that more emphasis should be given to Curriculum Development in Phase 2 to ensure that it had parity with In-service and Initial Teacher Training.

However, it was felt that the specific phrasing of some of the priorities could be revised to highlight the main objectives underpinning them. In particular, it was proposed to:

1. delete the first bullet point [*Stocktaking on history curricula in the region*] under **Curriculum Development** and revise the second bullet point to read: *initiate processes for dissemination of information and experience exchanges on the development and implementation of new curricula and organise co-operative workshops with curriculum planners and textbook publishers.*

2. delete the examples of periods, topics and themes at the end of the third bullet point under **Initial and in-service training of history teachers**. There was a long discussion of what should and should not appear in these two lists. Dr Stradling pointed out that these lists had never been intended to be prescriptive. They were just examples which emerged during the previous meeting. Nothing would be lost by omitting the lists and leaving the third bullet point as: *"regional training on how to teach topics, themes, periods which teachers often find difficult"*. The actual topics, themes or periods could then be determined by those at the local or regional level who were responsible for planning individual seminars and workshops.

3. delete references to these lists of themes and periods in the first bullet point under **The development of teaching resources for history** and to revise it to read: *"development of textbooks and other teaching resources"*.

Generally, it was felt that the Working Group should be seen to be positively encouraging those who intended to submit Phase 2 proposals for screening by the Task Force to think strategically. This would entail:

- Being aware of the Criteria for Project Proposal Assessment (appended to this Report), particularly relating to the clarity and appropriateness of the project's objectives, budgeting procedures and management structure; the emphasis on a regional dimension involving two or more participating countries; and the involvement of local as well as international expertise wherever possible.
- Showing how the proposed project will be relevant (a) to the overall objectives of the Task Force Education & Youth and (b) to one or more of the four priorities of the History Working Group.
- Showing evidence of a clear project implementation strategy with target groups, timescales, deadlines, project outcomes, etc.

- Showing evidence of a clear strategy for ensuring that the results of the project are disseminated as widely as possible to the intended target groups.
- Showing how the project will contribute to the building of networks.
- Showing evidence of a strategy for influencing policy makers to ensure that the project will have an impact on policy and practice.

Ideas for New Projects

Several members of the Working Group expressed an intention to submit proposals either for new projects or for extensions of existing projects. However, at this stage they were inclined to wait for the Task Force's call for new proposals before being too specific and to see whether their ideas fitted into the framework for Stability Pact funding or whether they would need to seek funding from donors outside the Stability Pact. Ideas which were briefly mentioned included:

Postgraduate credit-bearing courses for experienced history teachers in which accreditation would be based on their contributions to the development of school textbooks and other teaching resources [Professor Halil Berktaç]

A possible project on workshops in project development and proposal writing [Ms Joke van der Leeuw-Roord]

An extension to the project '*Creating Additional Materials for Teaching SEE History*' [Professor Karl Kaser]

Continued development of the SEE textbook website, although it is likely that this will take place outside the framework of the STP [Ms Heike Karge]

An evaluation of the new generation of history textbooks in the countries of the former Yugoslavia with a specific emphasis on how they address the history of the region in the 1980s and '90s [Ms Jasmina DJORDJEVIC]. Possibilities along similar lines were also mentioned by representatives from BiH and Serbia.

A transnational MA for history teachers, which would be delivered by several Universities in the region. The objective

would be to train the next generation of teacher trainers [Dr Carol CAPITA].

An extension of the Comparative Initial Teacher Training project to include a dissemination conference for Education Ministry representatives and Heads of TEIs and regional seminars for teacher trainers [Professor Alois Ecker]

Ms Heidrun SCHULZE wound up the discussion by reminding the Working Group that the call for proposals would go out sometime in mid-January 2002 with a submission deadline by mid-February and that, at this stage, they would be asking for outline proposals that would be examined by a screening committee. There would then be a second stage of proposal development related to seeking funding from donors.

Problems and Advantages (Item 7)

Ms Cardwell reminded the Working Group that the project coordinators and implementers who had attended the Informal Meeting in Strasbourg in August 2001 had been invited to send the Rapporteur a short summary of their experience of working within the Stability Pact framework. The results were summarised and appended to the Report which had subsequently been distributed to all members of the Working Group [DGIV/EDU/HIST (2001)08]. The summary was noted but not discussed at the meeting due to time constraints.

Project Evaluation (Item 9)

This remains an unresolved issue for the Working Group although it has been discussed at every meeting since the Group's inception. The problem, as Ms Schulze noted, is that there is no funding available for independent evaluation and the individual donors usually have their own systems for evaluating the projects which they fund. The key question is whether there is any congruence between the evaluation requirements of individual donors and the requirements of the Task Force and the Stability Pact. Professor Ecker observed that it would be helpful if the Task Force could explain what the evaluation is for (i.e. whether it is to inform the Task Force about developments, or to tell the community of donors what has been done, or to check on whether the project is meeting its objectives, or whether its primary aim is self-evaluation?). He also thought it

would be helpful if the Task Force could clarify what kind of format it envisaged for the evaluation.

Ms Schulze asked if project coordinators would be willing to send her copies of the evaluation reports which they currently send to their donors. This would help her to clarify the question of congruence. No-one expressed an objection to this request.

The Future of the Working Group

At the end of the meeting, the Working Group returned to some of the issues which had been raised in the discussion following Ms Schulze's presentation on developments in the Task Force and the Stability Pact.

The overall conclusions of the Group may be summarised as follows:

The Working Group has a useful role to play as a forum for discussing, developing and coordinating the implementation of new approaches to history education across the region. The Group also has a useful role to play in facilitating cross-fertilisation between projects and initiatives and in helping potential project coordinators to draw up proposals for funding.

It was widely felt within the Group that a better balance needed to be found between its function as a reporting body, its function as a forum for sharing ideas, experience, expertise and for facilitating cross-fertilisation, and its function as a *working* Group with the emphasis on cooperation between projects, experts and countries to improve history education at all levels. This shift of balance needed to be reflected in the Agenda for each meeting. This in turn means that project members should indicate to the Coordinator what items they would like included on the agenda when the draft version is distributed for comment beforehand.

The membership of the Working Group needs to be reviewed. At present it is heavily weighted towards the Universities and TEIs. There needed to be more representation from school history education. It is also essential to ensure good, proportionate representation from all of the countries in the region. Also representation should not be restricted to projects funded through the Stability Pact.

The Working Group should still continue to meet even after the Stability Pact had ended. However, it was recognised that each meeting probably costs around 8-10,000 Euros and it would be necessary to find a donor if meetings were to continue on an annual basis.

Consideration should also be given to ways of de-centralising some of the activities of the Working Group. Rather than always meeting as a full group it might sometimes be more fruitful to have meetings which focused on specific sectors or groups of projects (e.g. in-service training, initial training, curriculum development, textbook development, etc). The function of acting as a forum and information exchange does not necessarily always have to depend on face-to-face meetings. Some members raised the possibility of an Internet Chat room or Bulletin Board. This is something which could be set up and serviced through the initiative of individual members of the Group, perhaps even as a project.

Any Other Business (Item 10)

The Coordinator undertook to explore the possibility of inviting a representative of the Council of Europe's Education Committee to attend the next meeting of the Working Group. A number of members of the Group also asked if next year's meeting could be held in late November or earlier in December.

The date was provisionally fixed for 21 - 23 November 2002.

APPENDIX I - CRITERIA FRAMEWORK FOR PROJECT PROPOSAL ASSESMENT .

Projects submitted in the respective priority areas will be assessed according to the following Criteria:

Emphasis on a regional focus:

- Involvement of three or more countries of the region
- areas where cross-border/regional co-operation and networking provide a clear added value for:
 - national development efforts
 - enhancing participation in European networks/partnerships
 - the process of reconciliation
- development of regional/sub-regional/cross border co-operation-instruments

Local and international expertise and the European Dimension:

- key role of local experts in planning/implementation/evaluation
- further development of regional expertise, e.g. through training on the job
- added value through building on/complementing existing initiatives/programmes at regional, national or international levels (avoiding duplication)
- adaptation of successful international initiatives/expertise to the needs of the region

Impact on the system and the process of reform:

- co-operation of key actors on various levels (civil society, decision makers, etc.)
- minimising the risk of brain drain
- dissemination of the project experience (especially impact on policy and system development)
- possible follow-up measures

Impact on civil society:

- promotion of democratic processes in and through projects (eg participatory management)

- inclusion strategies for under-represented/excluded groups (minorities, disadvantaged, gender issues, rural areas, etc)
- furthering good neighbourly relations, inter-/cross-cultural exchanges

Technical and financial quality of the project:

- clear description of the objectives of the project
- duration of projects/programmes, steps and mechanism of implementation
- clear management structure
- indicators of progress and evaluation
- financial, administrative and technical capacities of the applicant's team,
- funding given (other funding sources) /requested, adequate transparency and accountability in the allocation and use of funds

Task Force Education and Youth, Strategic Framework and Priorities for Action, July 2001, p.22

APPENDIX II - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .

Dr Halil BERKTAY, Associate Professor, Sabanci University,
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Orhanli, Tuzla, 81474
ISTANBUL, Turkey

Tel: +90 216 483 92 37

Fax: +90 216 483 92 50

E-mail: hberktay@sabanciuniv.edu

Ms Aliye BURKAY, T.T.K.B Egitim Arastirma MRK, Besevler,
ANKARA

Tel: +90 312 212 65 30 319

Fax: + 90 312 223 35 09

E-mail: aliyeburkay@yahoo.com

Dr Carol CAPITA, University of Bucharest, Institute of
Educational Sciences, Calea Stirbei Voda 37, 70732 BUCHAREST,
Romania

Tel: +40 1 314 53 89/315 89 30

Fax: +40 1 312 14 47/40 01 310 06 80

E-mail: l_capita@hotmail.com

Ms Jasmina DJORDJEVIC, Historical Institute, Bul. Revolucise 3,
81000 PODGORICA, Montenegro

(Home address: Miladina Popovica 12)

Tel: +381 81 24 13 36

Fax: +381 81 24 13 36

E-mail: jasmindj@cg.ac.yu

Dr Alois ECKER, Institut für Wirtschafts und Sozialgeschichte,
Universität Wien, Dr Karl Lueger Ring, 1010 WIEN, Austria

Tel: +43 1 4277 41320

Fax: +43 1 4277 94 13

E-mail: alois.ecker@univie.ac.at

Dr Cagri ERHAN, Lecturer Political History Department, Faculty of
Political

Science, University of Ankara, Cebeci, 06590 ANKARA

Tel: + 90 312 320 49 36

Fax: + 90 312 320 50 61

E-mail: erhan@politics.ankara.edu.tr

Dr Enver HOXHAI, Department of History, University of Prishtina

Tel./Fax: +381 38 501 472

E-mail: enverhoxhaj@yahoo.com
Mr Alexander IVANCHEV, History Teacher, High School for
Ancient Languages and Culture, SOFIA
Tel: +35 92 988 49 10
Fax: +35 92 988 52 40
E-mail: sms-in@mvr.bg / alivanchev@yahoo.com

Ms. Heike KARGE, Georg Eckert Institute for International
Textbook Research, Celler Strasse 3, 38114 BRAUNSCHWEIG,
Germany
Tel: +49 531 5 90 99 62
Fax: +49 531 5 90 99 99
E-mail: karge@gei.de

Professor Karl KASER, CSBSC, Department for Southeast
European History, Mozartgasse 3A, 8010 GRAZ, Austria
Tel: +43 -316 380 23 52
Fax: +43 316 380 97 35
E-mail: kkaser@gewi.kfunigraz.ac.at

Mr Petrit NATHANAILI, Universiteti I Tiranes, Fakulteti Histori-
Filologji, Departamenti Historise, Rruga Elbasanit, TIRANA
Tel/fax: +355 4 22 41 09
Rr Jul Variboda n°8, TIRANA
Tel/Fax: + 355 4 22 73 70
E-mail: nathanp@sanx.net

Mr Boban PETROVSKI, Associate Professor at Skopje University,
Department of History, St Luka Gerov 48/2-10, 9100 SKOPJE,
"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
Tel/Fax: + 389 2 118 143
E-mail: ptrboban@yahoo.com

Ms Sabine RUTAR, Georg Eckert Institute for International
Textbook Research,
Celler Strasse 3, 38114 BRAUNSCHWEIG, Germany
Private address: Sentmaringer Weg 114 A, 48151 MUNSTER
Tel: +49 531 5 90 99 62/49 251 79 73 94 (private)
Fax: +49 531 5 90 99 99
E-mail: rutar@gei.de

Ms Heidrun SCHULZE, Task Force Education and Youth
(Enhanced Graz
Process), KulturKontakt, Spittelberggasse 3, 1070 Vienna,

Austria

Tel: +43 1 522 91 60 12

Fax: +43 1 524 66 55

E-mail: heidrun.schulze@kulturkontakt.or.at

Ms Biljana SIMUNOVIC-BESLIN, Sekspirova 9, 21000 NOVI SAD,
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

Dr Robert STRADLING, Leirsinn Centre for Gaelic Affairs, The
Gaelic College, University of the Highlands and Islands, Teangue,
Sleat, ISLE OF SKYE IV44 8RQ, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 1471 88 85 53/50

Fax: +44 1471 88 85 51

E-mail: bob@laoghras.demon.co.uk

Ms Pilvi TORSTI, Eerikinkatu 21 D 86, 00180 HELSINKI, Finland

Tel: +(mobile) 358 (0)40 71 91 206

E-mail: pilvi@iki.fi

Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD, Executive Director, EUROCLIO,
Juliana van Stolberglaan 41, 2595 CA DEN HAAG, The
Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 382 48 72

Fax: +31 70 385 36 69

E-mail: joke@euroclio.nl

ORGANISERS OF THE MEETING

Ms Alison CARDWELL, Administrator, Educational Policies and
European Dimension Division, Directorate General IV, Education,
Culture, Youth and Sport, Environment

Council of Europe, F - 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France

Tel: +33 3 88 41 26 17 Fax: +33 3 88 41 27 50/ 27 56

E-mail: alison.cardwell@coe.int

Ms. Kanita Kovacevic, Project Assistant, KulturKontakt Austria,
Office of the Task Force Education and Youth/Stability Pact

Tel: +43 1 522 91 60 12 Fax: +43 1 524 66 55

Email: kanita.kovacevic@kulturkontakt.or.at



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").